

Appl. No. : 09/424,006  
Filed : March 7, 2000

### REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 6-11. Claim 6 has been amended, and no new matter has been added. Thus, Claims 6-11 are presented for further examination. The amendment to Claim 6 is merely for clarification and thus does not narrow the scope of protection. Reconsideration and allowance of all Claims 6-11 in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,953,673 to Neubauer, et al.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the subscriber data sets include "at least subscription data as defined in GSM". As the Examiner indicated in the interview that the rejection of Claims 6 with respect to Neubauer is overcome by such an amendment, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 6 as being in condition for allowance.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 6, 8, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,067 to Pfundstein.

Claim 6 has been amended to clarify that "each subscriber environment corresponds to a call number". Support for this amendment appears in Applicant's specification at page 6, lines 9 and page 3, line 15, for example. Because the Examiner indicated in the interview that the rejection of Claim 6 based on Pfundstein would be overcome by such an amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

Because Claims 7-11 depend from Claim 6, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance; at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claim, and for their other features.

#### Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes

Appl. No. : 09/424,006  
Filed : March 7, 2000

pursuant to statutory section 102, the reasons therefor, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of these amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 11/12/04

By: \_\_\_\_\_

John M. Carson  
Registration No. 34,303  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

SADOCSTCMTCM-3677.DOC  
091504